

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ANDREA LAURA JACOBS,
Plaintiff

v.

**SOCIAL SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION,**
Defendant

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

No. 1:15-cv-02457

(Judge Kane)
(Magistrate Judge Cohn)

ORDER

THE BACKGROUND OF THIS ORDER IS AS FOLLOWS:

Before the Court is the March 3, 2017 Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Cohn recommending that the Court affirm the Social Security Commissioner's final decision denying Plaintiff Andrea Laura Jacob's application for child's insurance benefits and supplemental security income under the Social Security Act. (Doc. No. 25.)

Plaintiff has filed a hand-written motion paper entitled "Reply/Appealing" that this Court construes as an objection to Magistrate Judge Cohn's Report and Recommendation. (Doc. No. 26).¹ Indeed, the Court observes from this filing that Plaintiff has principally objected to Magistrate Judge Cohn's conclusion that substantial evidence supports the Administrative Law Judge's determination that Plaintiff was not disabled from June 30, 2012 to May 15, 2014. (Id.) Having considered Plaintiff's objection, the Court finds that Magistrate Judge Cohn properly and comprehensively addressed the substance of this objection in the Report and Recommendation

¹ The Magistrate Act, 28 U.S.C. § 636, and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), provide that any party may file written objections to a magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations. In deciding whether to accept, reject, or modify the Report and Recommendation, the Court is to make a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); M.D. Pa. L.R. 72.3.

itself.² Accordingly, the Court will not write separately to address Plaintiff's objection to Magistrate Judge Cohn's Report and Recommendation.

AND SO, on this 20th day of March 2017, upon independent review of the record and applicable law, and after careful consideration of Magistrate Judge Cohn's Report and Recommendation, **IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

1. Plaintiff's objection to Magistrate Judge Cohn's Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 26), is **OVERRULED**;
2. The Court adopts the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 25), of Magistrate Judge Cohn;
3. The Commissioner's decision is **AFFIRMED**, and Plaintiff's request for relief is **DENIED**;
4. Judgment is entered in favor of the Commissioner and against Plaintiff; and
5. The Clerk of Court shall **CLOSE** the case.

s/ Yvette Kane
Yvette Kane, District Judge
United States District Court
Middle District of Pennsylvania

² Indeed, the Court observes from its review of Plaintiff's objection to the Report and Recommendation that Plaintiff has merely restated arguments previously presented in her April 7, 2016 brief (Doc. No. 18), and May 27, 2016 memorandum of law (Doc. No. 20), which were considered by Magistrate Judge Cohn as reflected in the Report and Recommendation, and has expressed her general disagreement with the Administrative Law Judge's underlying decision.